



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,547	02/26/2004	Michel Sayag	SAY1P004D1	9483
22434	7590	06/07/2004	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP				LEE, SHUN K
P.O. BOX 778				ART UNIT
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778				PAPER NUMBER
				2878

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/789,547	SAYAG, MICHEL <i>OK</i>
Examiner	Art Unit	
Shun Lee	2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 9-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2-8 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because:

- (a) in Fig. 1, "Photosentitive area 112" should probably be --Photosensitive area 112--;
- (b) in Fig. 2, "Photosentitive area 204" should probably be --Photosensitive area 204--;
- (c) in Fig. 3, "Photosentitive area" should probably be --Photosensitive area--;
- (d) in Fig. 4, "Photosentitive area 418" should probably be --Photosensitive area 418--; and
- (e) in Fig. 8, "die" should probably be --dye--.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are also objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 2302. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on pg. 22, "die" in line 13 should probably be --dye--. Appropriate correction is required.

5. The use of the trademark Mylar (pg. 24, line 10), Schott (pg. 25, line 25 and pg. 42, line 20), and Teflon (pg. 26, line 24, pg. 28, line 18, and pg. 29, line 20) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized (e.g., MYLAR) wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 9, 11, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller *et al.* (WO 99/28765 with corresponding US 6,373,074) in view of Alvarez (US 5,221,843).

In regard to claim 1, Mueller *et al.* disclose (Figs. 1 and 7) an integrated x-ray image capture and readout system, comprising:

- (a) a cassette enclosure (70) having a form factor;
- (b) a storage-phosphor plate (15) operable to capture incident x-rays corresponding to an image;
- (c) a stimulating light source (11) operable to expose a surface of the storage-phosphor plate (15) to stimulating light;
- (d) an array of detectors (12) positioned to receive stimulated light via the surface of the storage-phosphor plate (15), the stimulated light being released from the storage-phosphor plate (15) in response to the stimulating light; and
- (e) an actuator assembly (71, 72, 73) operable to effect relative motion between the surface of the storage-phosphor plate (15) and each of the stimulating light source (11) and the array of detectors (12) in one dimension (A);

wherein the storage-phosphor plate (15), the stimulating light source (11), the array of detectors (12), and the actuator assembly (71, 72, 73) are enclosed in the cassette enclosure (70).

The system of Mueller *et al.* lacks an explicit description that the cassette enclosure form factor corresponding to a standard radiographic film cassette. However, Mueller *et al.* also disclose (US 6,373,074 column 10, lines 55-57) that the cassette enclosure form factor is such that it can be inserted in conventional x-ray units already in operation. Further, conventional x-ray units already in operation are well known in the art. For example, Alvarez teach (column 2, lines 32-40) that nearly all medical equipment is designed for film cassettes (*i.e.*, standard radiographic film cassettes) and that compatibility with these film cassette holder is highly desirable. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a cassette enclosure form factor in the system of Mueller *et al.* corresponding to a standard radiographic film cassette form factor, in order that the system is insertable in conventional x-ray units already in operation.

In regard to claim 9 which is dependent on claim 1, Mueller *et al.* also disclose (Figs. 1 and 7) that the actuator assembly (71, 72, 73) is disposed along an edge of the cassette enclosure (70) to maximize an imaging area of the storage-phosphor plate (15).

In regard to claim 11 which is dependent on claim 1, Mueller *et al.* also disclose (Figs. 1 and 7) that the actuator assembly (71, 72, 73) comprises a magnetic linear

motor (*i.e.*, comprising guide bars 71, 72 as reaction components for linear motor 73; US 6,373,074 column 10, lines 29-39).

In regard to claim 12 which is dependent on claim 1, Mueller *et al.* also disclose (Figs. 1 and 7) that the array of detectors (12) is operable to convert the stimulated light to electronic data corresponding to the image, the system further comprising a transmission medium (*i.e.*, interface ports; US 6,373,074 column 10, lines 49-51) for transmitting the electronic data out of the cassette enclosure (70).

In regard to claim 20 which is dependent on claim 1, Mueller *et al.* also disclose (Figs. 1 and 7) that the actuator assembly (71, 72, 73) comprises a magnetic linear motor (*i.e.*, comprising guide bars 71, 72 as reaction components for linear motor 73; US 6,373,074 column 10, lines 29-39) and the stimulating light source (11) and the array of detectors (12) are configured on a translation stage (10).

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller *et al.* (WO 99/28765 with corresponding US 6,373,074) in view of Alvarez (US 5,221,843) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Floresta *et al.* (US 6,239,516) and Budinski *et al.* (US 5,912,944).

In regard to claim 10 which is dependent on claim 1, while Mueller *et al.* also disclose (Figs. 1 and 7; US 6,373,074 column 10, lines 29-39) that the actuator assembly (71, 72, 73) comprises guide bars 71, 72 as reaction components for linear motor 73, the system of Mueller *et al.* lacks that at least a portion of the actuator assembly comprises a radiolucent material. However, linear motors are well known in the art. For example, Floresta *et al.* teach (column 2, line 47 to column 3, line 27) that a

linear motor comprising resin epoxy have a number of advantageous such as enhanced performance. Further, Budinski *et al.* teach (column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 2) that cassettes are formed from epoxy since epoxy have very small x-ray attenuation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the actuator assembly in the system of Mueller *et al.* with resin epoxy (which is inherently a radiolucent material), in order to obtain an enhanced linear motor performance.

10. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller *et al.* (WO 99/28765 with corresponding US 6,373,074) in view of Alvarez (US 5,221,843) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dewaele (US 5,757,021).

In regard to claims **13-15** which are dependent on claim 1, the system of Mueller *et al.* lacks a radio frequency detector for detecting radio frequency energy in close proximity to the cassette enclosure, the radio frequency energy corresponding to patient information to be associated with the image, and a radio frequency transmitter included in one of a wrist band and a badge disposed outside of the cassette enclosure for generating the radio frequency energy. Dewaele teach (column 9, lines 20-63) a radio frequency detector for detecting radio frequency energy in close proximity to the cassette enclosure (*i.e.*, radio frequency tags on storage-phosphor cassettes), the radio frequency energy corresponding to patient information to be associated with the image (*i.e.*, radio frequency tags in one of a hospital bracelet or an identification card; column 11, lines 35-37), in order to associate the radiographic image with a patient (column 1,

lines 37-38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a hospital bracelet in the system of Mueller *et al.* for transmitting radio frequency energy (*i.e.*, patient information) to a radio frequency tag on the cassette, in order to associate the radiographic image with a patient.

11. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller *et al.* (WO 99/28765 with corresponding US 6,373,074) in view of Alvarez (US 5,221,843) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Karella (US 5,864,146).

In regard to claims **16-19** which are dependent on claim 1, the system of Mueller *et al.* lacks an image capture detection circuitry comprising an x-ray detector (e.g., a photodiode for detection prompt emission of the storage-phosphor plate) for detecting some of the incident x-rays and generating a signal indicative whether capture of the incident x-rays is occurring, and that the signal is employed to control actuation of the actuator assembly. Karella teaches (column 36, line 60 to column 37, line 21) to detect prompt emission from a storage-phosphor plate in order to assess the level of x-ray exposure in order to adjust the reading of the storage-phosphor plate. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an image capture detection circuitry comprising an x-ray detector (e.g., a photodiode for detection prompt emission of the storage-phosphor plate) in the system of Mueller *et al.*, in order to obtain a signal which is to adjust the storage-phosphor plate reading (e.g., by controlling the actuation of the actuator assembly).

12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller *et al.* (WO 99/28765 with corresponding US 6,373,074) in view of Alvarez (US 5,221,843) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Floresta *et al.* (US 6,239,516).

In regard to claim 21 which is dependent on claim 20, while Mueller *et al.* also disclose (Figs. 1 and 7) that the magnetic linear motor (*i.e.*, comprising guide bars 71, 72 as reaction components for linear motor 73; US 6,373,074 column 10, lines 29-39) comprises at least one guide bar (71, 72) disposed inside and along an edge of the cassette enclosure (70), and a linear motor actuator (73) coupled to the translation stage (10), the system of Mueller *et al.* lacks an explicit description that the guide bars (71, 72) comprise magnets. However, linear motors are well known in the art. For example, Floresta *et al.* teach (column 1, lines 7-63) it is known in the art that guide bars as reaction components for a linear motor comprise magnets. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the reaction components in the system of Mueller *et al.* comprise of magnets as is well known in the art.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller *et al.* (WO 99/28765 with corresponding US 6,373,074) in view of Alvarez (US 5,221,843) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

In regard to claim 22 which is dependent on claim 1, the system of Mueller *et al.* lacks that standard radiographic film cassette form factors have a set of dimensions

corresponding to one of 14" X 17", 14" X 14", 10" X 12", 8" X 10", 35 cm X 43 cm, 35 cm X 35 cm, 20 cm X 40 cm, 18 cm X 43 cm, 13 cm X 18 cm, 13 cm X 30 cm, 18 cm X 24 cm, and 24 cm X 30 cm. Applicant admits (last paragraph on pg. 19) as Prior Art that standard radiographic film cassette form factors have a set of dimensions corresponding to one of 14" X 17", 14" X 14", 10" X 12", 8" X 10", 35 cm X 43 cm, 35 cm X 35 cm, 20 cm X 40 cm, 18 cm X 43 cm, 13 cm X 18 cm, 13 cm X 30 cm, 18 cm X 24 cm, and 24 cm X 30 cm. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a cassette enclosure form factor in the system of Mueller *et al.* corresponding to a known standard radiographic film cassette form factor (e.g., 35 cm X 35 cm), in order that the system is insertable in conventional x-ray units already in operation.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 2-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

15. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the instant application is deemed to be directed to an nonobvious improvement over the invention patented in US Patent 6,373,074. The improvement comprises in combination with other recited elements, an actuator driver positioned externally to the cassette enclosure and operationally coupled to the actuator assembly via a mechanical link.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shun Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SL



CONSTANTINE HANNAHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2878